REMARKS

Claim 1 calls for a method of detecting a characteristic of an optical device having at least two optical inputs and two optical outputs. A light source is coupled to that device through a switch which has at least one output and at least two outputs. The at least two outputs of the switch are coupled to the two inputs of the device. Then, each of the two outputs of the device are coupled to a different detector. Thus, you need a light source, coupled to a switch, coupled to the two inputs of a device whose two outputs are connected to detectors.

Nothing of the sort is shown in Figure 3, which was relied on previously. That is because the RX 330 has no switch.

In response, the Examiner points to paragraph 36 which refers to the embodiment of Figure 5. There, it suggests that if a succession of photons are temporally multiplexed that succession of photons may be separated by a series of optical switches. The effect of the optical switches is shown in Figure 5. Further, it is pointed out in paragraph 36 that the demultiplexing can be accomplished with an optical switch operating to deliver photons to the detectors.

Thus, several problems come up in connection with trying to use the material in paragraph 36, which is a different embodiment than Figure 3, to anticipate claim 1. It is not clear what would be the device, what would be the switch, and what would be the detector. There is a discussion of detectors coupled to switches, but then there is no device as well. Moreover, the claim requires that the device be coupled to the light source through the switch. All we have in paragraph 36 is discussions of switches coupled to detectors. Moreover, the device must include two inputs and at least two outputs. It is not even clear what the device would be, much less its inputs and outputs. In addition, the switch must be coupled to the two inputs of that device. The two outputs of the device must be coupled to a different detector.

All we know from the discussion in paragraph 36 about the embodiment of Figure 5 is that the switches are connected to the detectors which cannot meet the description of claim 1 without more information.

Moreover, referring to Figure 5, it is seen that a so-called demultiplexing action is achieved when a series of pulses 1, 2, 3, 4, in succession, are demultiplexed into a smaller number of pulses and passed to each of four detectors. This plainly indicates that each of the switches only has one output. However, the claim requires that the switches have at least one

input and at least two outputs. Certainly, there is no description of exactly how these switches are configured, but the indication in Figure 5 is that there is a switch for each of the APDs 1-4 and, therefore, the switch only has one output. It is noted in connection with paragraph 36 that it refers to a series of optical switches, not a single optical switch.

Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection of claim 1 is, again, requested.

Claim 7 also calls for a 1x2 optical switch which, as discussed above, is not taught in connection with paragraph 36 of the cited reference. Moreover, the optical switch does not have two outputs coupled to the at least two optical inputs of some device. It does not appear that there are enough elements in the discussion of paragraph 36 to also have the device. Finally, there are no two photodetectors, each of which is coupled to a different one of at least two optical outputs. Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection of claim 7 is requested.

Claim 11 calls for a polarization controller. It is indicated that Flusberg teaches a polarization controller in paragraphs 39-40. While there are discussions of polarization in those paragraphs, there is no discussion of a polarization controller. Moreover, there is no discussion anywhere of different polarization states being generated by any such polarization controller in paragraphs 39 and 40. Also, there is no discussion there of providing the polarization states to a first input port of a device under test or simultaneously providing outputs from said device under test to at least two different photodetectors. Finally, there is no discussion of any successive providing of different polarization states to the second input port of the device under test while simultaneously detecting output signals from two different output ports of the device under test.

Certainly, the discussion of paragraphs 39 and 40 has nothing to do with Figure 3.

It is also suggested that the item 120 in Figure 1C might be a polarization controller. However, the item 120 in Figure 1C is merely described as a node. It does not generate different polarization states. Those states are not provided to an input port of a device under test and the outputs from the device under test are not provided to different photodetectors. Moreover, there is no successively providing different polarization states to a second input port of the device under test while simultaneously detecting output signals from two different output ports of the device under test. Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection of claim 11 is requested.

On the same basis, reconsideration of the rejection of claim 14 is respectfully requested.

Claim 17 is also rejected under Flusberg. Again, there is no polarization controller in Flusberg and, certainly, not one that produces four Mueller polarization states. Also, there is no

one by at least two optical switch coupled to the output of any such polarization controller and connectable to at least two input ports of a device under test. There are no two photodetectors connected to different ones of the at least two output ports of a device under test.

Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection of claim 17 is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 14, 2005

Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Ste. 100
Houston, TX 77024
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation